

## **Psalm 2**

(c) Albert Pietersma, November 1999

### **Synopsis:**

Ps 2 describes the nations of the world as having boastfully conspired to rid themselves of servitude to their divine overlord and his anointed deputy (1-3). In response the Lord will treat them with derision and address them in anger (4-5). Meanwhile the Lord's anointed reveals that he has been duly appointed king by God and cites the decree of installation and universal lordship. As son of God he is the logical heir to the empire (6-9). The psalm then issues a stern warning to the rebels (10-12c), and pronounces happiness on all who trust in the Lord (12d).

### **Psalm 2 as a whole:**

Various commentators on the Hebrew text have suggested that Ps 2, in its present location, was meant to function as an introduction to the Davidic Psalter which follows (e.g. Briggs [lxxxi], Wilson [78?]). Since, in the Greek, one of the actors, i.e. the Lord's appointed king, plays a more prominent role than in MT (see v. 6-7a), this view has seemingly received some added support. For Ps 1 and Ps 2 forming an inclusio see on 12d below.

Though several witnesses (Sa 2151 R<sup>s</sup> La Ga) make this psalm into an ode or psalm pertaining to David, thus adding it to the Davidic collection that follows, this ascription is clearly no more original than the notation in part of Bo that the psalm is a prophesy about Christ. As in MT so in LXX, Ps 2 was originally without a title. Its absence seems to be confirmed by 11QPs<sup>c</sup> and 4Q174 (Flint 148).

**Specific Bibliography:**

Cazelle, H. "*Nçqw br* (Ps 2,12)," *Oriens Antiquus* 3 (1964) 43-45. Dubarle, A. M. "ΔΡΑΞΑΣΘΕ ΠΑΙΔΕΙΑΣ (Ps., II, 12)," *RB* 62 (1955) 511-12. Kunz, P. L. "Der 2. Psalm in neuer Sicht," *BZ* (NF) 20 (1976) 238-42. Macintosh, A. A. "A Consideration of Problems presented by Psalm 2:11," *JTS* (NS) 27 (1976) 1-14. Pili, F. "Possibili casi di metatesi in Genesi 49:10 e Salmo 2:11-12a," *Augustianum* 15 (1975) 457-71. Robinson, A. "Deliberate but Misguided Haplography Explains Psalm 2:11-12," *ZAW* 89 (1977) 421-22. VanderKam, J. *Bhl* in Ps 2:5 and its Etymology," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 245-50. Wilhelmi, G. "Der Hirt mit dem eisernen Szepter," *VT* 27 (1977) 196-204.

**Commentary: v. 1**

## Hebrew Text

למה רגשו גוים  
ולאזמים יהגו ריק

## Greek Text

ἵνα τί ἐφράξαν ἔθνη  
καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά;

## NETS Translation

Why did nations grow insolent  
and peoples contemplate vain things?

The interrogative form of the opening lines underscores the utter folly of the rebels' act.

ἐφράξαν. Since the verbal form of רגש appears only here in MT, it is possible that G was not familiar with its meaning. The noun, however, occurs in both 54.15 (רגש), where

G glosses is as ὁμόνοια, and 63.3 (רַגְזָה) where πλήθος is given as its counterpart. But since the sense of "tumult, commotion" is nowhere made explicit, it may be that G is simply contextualizing. Elsewhere in the LXX corpus the verb, though as a medio-passive, occurs only in 2Makk 7.34 and 3Makk 2.2. Its derived noun φρύαγμα, however, appears in 3Makk 6.16 and as a counterpart for רַגְזָה in Hos 4.18 (?), Zach 11.3, Ier 12.5. Iezek 7.24, 24.21. If the Hebrew of Ps 2.1 has the sense of "congregating in commotion" (see Craigie), the Greek on the other hand quite clearly has to do with "insolent pride." This surreal and futile challenge to divine power is then continued in line 2. It may be noted, however, that since G sticks to his default (רַגְזָה = μελετάω [10x]), any notion of grumbling/growling in discontent, which the Hebrew verb may be said to have, is lost in the Greek, though, as is clear from Thucydides (LSJ), μελετάω is not unknown in military contexts.

As is clear from NETS, in accordance with G's default equation in 1a, the temporal reference becomes past throughout 1-2.

## v. 2

### Hebrew Text

יְתִיצְבוּ מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ  
 וְרוֹזְנִים נוֹסְדוּ יַחַד  
 עַל יְהוָה וְעַל מְשִׁיחוֹ

### Greek Text

παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς,  
 καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ  
 κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ

διάψαλμα

## NETS Translation

The kings of the earth stood side by side,  
 and the rulers gathered together,  
 against the Lord and against his anointed, saying<sup>a</sup>,

*Interlude on strings*

<sup>a</sup>Lacking in Gk

παρέστησαν. The united action of the kings, implicit in the Hebrew, is made explicit in the Greek by the prefixed verb, which thus acts well as a balance to final phrase of line 2.

κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου. Since G relatively rarely articulates κύριος unless the Hebrew gives formal warrant (e.g. inseparable prepositions or the *nota accusativi*), the article, if original, may be assumed to have special significance. Since the entire Greek tradition supports its presence, it is best considered part of OG. The key to its understanding lies no doubt in the following, parallel phrase. Since χριστός functions as an epithet (rather than a personal name), κύριος is made to follow suit, even though as a rendering of the tetragram it is predominantly a name in Psalms (and predominantly anarthrous), rather than being a descriptive. As a result of G's interpretive move, the Greek text more explicitly than the Hebrew strikes the note of divine lordship over earthly rulers.

διάψαλμα. MT features no corresponding  $\text{הַלְלוּ}$ , its only equivalent in G, and the originality of διάψαλμα is consequently not above suspicion. Rahlfs understandably opted for it, since its presence is broadly attested (B' Sa O-Ga, et La<sup>R</sup> post 2b). Of interest is, however, that the entire *L* group, plus R<sup>s</sup> Sy, side with MT. To the latter can now also be added 2150 2151(uid.) of iv CE. But 2150 is probably a lectionary text which also dropped superscriptions; 2151, on the other hand, is seemingly expansive and is therefore better evidence.

## v. 3

## Hebrew Text

ננתקה את מוסרותימו  
ונשליכה ממנו עבתימו

## Greek Text

Διαρρήξωμεν τοὺς δεσμοὺς αὐτῶν  
καὶ ἀπορρίψωμεν ἀφ' ἡμῶν τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτῶν.

## NETS Translation

“Let us burst their bonds asunder,  
and cast their yoke from us.”

τὸν ζυγὸν αὐτῶν. Though the image of MT, in complementary clauses, is evidently that of bondage and imprisonment (cf. "bonds"), the Greek in the second line extends the emphasis of 2c on divine suzerainty (cf. "yoke"). See further δουλεύω in v. 11.

## v. 4

## Hebrew Text

יֹשֵׁב בַּשָּׁמַיִם יִשְׁחַק<sup>a</sup> לְמוֹ  
אֲדַנִּי יִלְעַג לְמוֹ<sup>a1</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Omit MT

## Greek Text

ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐκγελάσεται αὐτούς,  
καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐκμυκτηριεῖ αὐτούς,

NETS Translation

He who resides in the heavens will laugh at them;  
and the Lord will hold them in derision.

ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς. The notion that כּוּשׁׁ means explicitly "to sit enthroned" (cf. Briggs ["one enthroned"], Craigie ["the Enthroned One"], Kraus ["he who is enthroned"], see KBL) finds no support either here or anywhere else in the Greek Psalter. Moreover, that the following prepositional phrase should modify the finite verb rather than the participle, as Craigie has it, is scarcely possible in the Greek.

ἐκγελάσεται αὐτούς Briggs thought it likely that G's parent text had לְמַלְכוּת following the verb (see 36:13, 51:8, 58:9, 103:26). This receives further support from the copula which, in the Greek, begins the next line (καὶ < ἵ), which may then have been produced by dittography. One may also note that since the Hebrew imperfect is regularly rendered by a the Greek future (which continues through v. 5), the temporal contrast between the past action of the rebels and the future action announced by the Lord is more sharply drawn than in MT. The future reference, though only a default in G, would then lend itself to eschatological interpretation of the psalm as a whole, something taken full advantage of in reception history.

ὁ κύριος. MT reads יְיָ (=<sup>c</sup>11QPs), though the T(argum) and many Hebrew mss (see BHS) have יהוה. Since G rarely articulated κύριος when it stands for the tetragram—unless his parent text gave explicit warrant (see comment on v. 2)—but tended to articulate κύριος when it represented יְיָ with or without such warrant (cf. 8.2, 10, 36.13, 38.8, 44.12, 53.6, 67.18, 129.6), it is likely that G here read with MT. In

the present context it should be noted that the article nicely balances that of the first line, and the focus on κύριος as descriptive inadvertently or by design perpetuates the theme underscored in v. 2.

## v. 5

### Hebrew Text

אז ידבר אלימו באפו  
ובחרונו יבהלמו

### Greek Text

τότε λαλήσει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ  
καὶ ἐν τῷ θυμῷ αὐτοῦ ταράξει αὐτούς.

### NETS Translation

Then he will speak to them in his wrath,  
and trouble them in his anger.

ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτοῦ. Of interest but uncertain significance is that whereas ὀργῇ is anarthrous, its parallel (τῷ θυμῷ) in the structurally identical phrase is arthrous. Though the added long syllable obviously has a rhythmic effect, it is less sure that G's move was deliberate.

ὀργῇ. Flashar has argued that for G ὀργή is the central word for divine anger directed at the psalmist's and God's enemies, whereas he uses θυμός vis-à-vis the "I" of the psalms, Israel or the individual pious person (see espec. p. 263). In order to account for the resultant inconsistencies in the Greek text, Flashar (259, 261) then cites G's concern for μεταβολή, stylistic variation. His central point is, however, too schematic and not borne out by the evidence, 2.12 being a case in point. Since there God's anger is clearly directed

at his enemies and the Hebrew text (12c) speaks of his **רָא**, for which G's default is *ὀργή* (21x), he nevertheless uses his secondary default *θυμός* (9x) rather than his primary one (*ὀργή*). Why? Possibly—and on this matter Flashar's observation is valid—, as was noted in comment on 1.1, G does show a degree of sensitivity to the Greek stylistic principle of variation (*μεταβολή*), and 12a has already featured the verbal form *ὀργισθῆ* (cf. also 73.1, 105.40, 123.3, and further 26.9, 29.6, 36.8, 54.4, 68.25, 76.10, 77.21, 38, 49, 84.5-6, 89.7, 94.11).

*ταράξει*. If **בדהל** means "to speak passionately," as J. VanderKam has suggested), G was unaware of it, since throughout he renders it by *ταράσσω* (2.5, 6.3, 4, 11, 29.8, 47.6, 82.16, 18, 89.7, 103.29), a verb he uses for no fewer than 20 Hebrew roots. G's choice in 2.5 produces a text that speaks of "disarray" and "disorder" inspired by divine anger, rather than of the "fear" or "terror" that would likely have caused it.

#### vv. 6-7a

##### Hebrew Text

ואני נסכתי מלכי  
 על ציון הר קדשי  
 אספרה אל חק יהוה

##### Greek Text

Ἐγὼ δὲ κατεστάθην βασιλεὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ  
 ἐπὶ Σιών ὄρος τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ  
 διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα κυρίου

##### NETS Translation

"But I was established king by him,



on Sion, his holy mountain,  
proclaiming the decree of the Lord:

Whereas MT has the Lord himself announce the installation of his anointed on Sion (v. 6), and then features the anointed to impart the precise wording of the Lord's investiture, in the Greek it is the new king who first proclaims (to the rebels) his having come to power and then cites the Lord's oracle. Dahood essentially sides with the Greek by pointing the verb in 6a as passive and reading the following 1st sg suffixes as 3rd sg. Though it is not impossible that G derives from a parent text at variance with MT, it appears more likely that G was responsible for the changes. A number of interrelated interpretive moves have been made in vv. 6-7. First, the initial conjunction in 6a is rendered as an adversative (δέ), thereby signaling a contrast with what precedes. Second, the active statement of 6a is transformed into a passive, which entails not only a different vocalization of the verb (See Dahood) but, more importantly, the addition of an agent phrase (ὑπ' αὐτοῦ). Surprisingly, in view of its standard use in Greek to express agency, ὑπό + gen is virtually absent from the Greek Psalter. On the two other occasions where G does employ it, there are special circumstances, as it were. In 73.22, in the absence of a passive verb, G seemingly wants to make sure that חַרְפְּתֶךָ מִנִּי נָבֵל ("your reproach from the fool") is understood as an act *by* the fool: . . . τῶν ὀνειδισμῶν σου τῶν ὑπὸ ἄφρονος. Similarly, in 106.2 he ensures that גְּאוּלֵי יְהוָה ("the redeemed of Yahweh") is understood as "those redeemed *by* the Lord": οἱ λελυτρωμένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου. Consequently, it is clear that when G strictly translates from the Hebrew, he makes no use of ὑπό + gen to express agency. Third, the two first person suffixes in v. 6 are dropped or rendered as third person respectively (see Dahood). Fourth, the 1st person finite verb (7a) is translated by a circumstantial participle in concord with the subject of the main verb in 6, thus changing the reference from the Lord himself to the anointed. Fifth, the second verb in 7 (εἶπεν) is given an explicit subject (κύριος), reinforcing the contrast with what precedes.

There can be no doubt that, taken individually, several of these differences between our present Hebrew and Greek texts could have arisen accidentally in either tradition, but taken together they suggest not only a certain deliberateness in reinterpretation, but that this reinterpretation was done by G. If that is in fact the case, and since G can scarcely be accused of frequently altering his parent text, it probably means that the new, more explicitly messianic understanding was already well established in Jewish exegetical tradition by the time Psalm 2 was translated into Greek. It is, furthermore, not without interest that in this relatively short psalm, the text has been rendered more explicit on, perhaps, six occasions: 6a (+ὕπ' αὐτοῦ), 7b and 12a(+κύριος), 8a (+σοι), 11b (+αὐτῷ), 12b (+δικαίᾳς).

πρόσταγμα. G regularly translates ׀׀ by δικαίωμα ("regulation, requirement" 24x), on six occasions (2.7, 80.5, 93.20, 98.7, 104.10, 148.6) he opted for πρόσταγμα ("decree, injunction") instead. Since the basic sense of δικαίωμα is "what is deemed right for one" while πρόσταγμα has more to do with "what one is ordered to do, no questions asked," G's choice here is perhaps surprising. Nevertheless, πρόσταγμα would seem to entail a difference in addressee from the Hebrew. There can be little doubt that in MT the ׀׀ is addressed to the newly enthroned king. As Kraus notes: "׀׀ is a term from sacral law. It denotes the document of legitimacy, the royal protocol that was written down at the enthronement and thereafter identified the legitimate ruler" (129-30). But if the new king is the primary addressee in the Hebrew, the primary addressees of the Greek would seem to be the rebellious rulers; in other words the document of installation has become a decree issued to the rebels, though its contents has not changed.

#### vv. 7b-9

#### Hebrew Text

אמר אלי בני אתה  
אני היום ילדתיך  
שאל ממני ואתנה גוים נחלתך  
ואחזתך אפסי ארץ  
תרעם בשבט ברזל  
ככלי יוצר תנפצם

#### Greek Text

Κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με Υἱός μου εἶ σύ,  
ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε·  
αἴτησαι παρ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου  
καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς·  
ποιμανεῖς αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ,  
ὡς σκεῦος κεραμέως συντρίψεις αὐτούς.

#### NETS Translation

The Lord said to me, 'You are my son;  
today I have begotten you.  
Ask of me, and I will give you nations as your heritage,  
and as your possession the ends of the earth.  
You shall shepherd them with an iron staff<sup>b</sup>,  
and shatter them like a potter's vessel.'

<sup>b</sup>Or *rod*

Except for the initial four words, these lines constitute the Lord's decree of investiture, proclaimed by the Lord's anointed to the scheming rebels. The decree identifies him as the

Lord's own son, invites him to state his resultant claim to territory and population, and predicts his irresistible and universal might.

Κύριος. Though it is possible that G accidentally read the tetragram twice (see MT), it is perhaps more likely that he did so deliberately (see comment on 7a).

σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε. Though the adverbial qualifier in both texts makes clear that a present reality (rather than a past event) is in view—thought originally to refer to the day of coronation for the next in line of David's house—G's relatively rare use of the stative aspect does full and explicit justice to this.

καὶ δώσω σοι. BHS wonders whether the parent text may not have read  $\text{וְיָתַן$  in place of MT's  $\text{וְיָתַן$ . One might argue that since, on a number of other occasions in this psalm, G merely renders the Hebrew explicit, σοι need be nothing more than an explicit Indirect Object. Furthermore, the Hebrew syntax presupposed by BHS would seem to be problematic. While it is true that  $\text{וְיָתַן$  may take a suffix, that such a suffix then plays the role of Indirect Object (in an S-V-IO-O sentence), would seem unattested. Thus one would need to posit a prepositional phrase ( $\text{לְךָ}$ ?) for σοι.

ποιμανεῖς αὐτούς. Though, as vocalized by the Masoretes, MT's verb is  $\text{רָעַע$  II ("to break"), a hapax legomenon in Psalms and said to be an Aramaism (cf. Kraus), G read it as  $\text{רָעַע$  I ("to shepherd"). Most commentators favor the reading of MT, but Briggs, and more recently Wilhelmi (1977), prefer the Greek. Interestingly, as Wilhelmi notes, 9<sup>1</sup> in the Greek contains an oxymoron (to *shepherd* with an *iron staff*), but it is less clear that the second line does as well, and can therefore be used to validate the first, as Wilhelmi believes. For that to work, we should have had the potter smash his own creation, rather than have the newly appointed ruler do the deed. That being the case, one suspects that

the reading of G is due to a mistaken derivation which has inadvertently given rise to the oxymoron. Not without interest, however, is Mich 5.5: καὶ ποιμανοῦσι τὸν Ἀσσοῦρ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ("and they [the seven shepherds] will shepherd Assour with a sword"). The Hebrew verb there is derived from רעע II (KBL) or רעה I (BDB). Thus while G's reading of Ps 2.9 may stand in tension with its context, the image per se appears viable. Of further interest, as Wilhelmi notes, is PsSal 17.23b-24a, which belongs to a prayer for "a son of David": ἐκτριψαι ὑπερηφανίαν ἀμαρτωλοῦ ὡς σκεύη κεραμέως, ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ συντριψαι πᾶσαν ὑπόστασιν αὐτῶν ("to destroy the sinner's pride like potter's vessels; with an iron rod, to smash their confidence"). It is difficult not to see here an explicit reference to Ps 2.9, likely in its Greek form, since it features a unique equation of רפּ pi. with συντριβω, precisely the verb we find in PsSal 17.24a. (The equation רפּ pi.-ἐκτριβω is not attested in the Greek corpus.)

Due to G's derivation of MT's verb in Ps 2.9, MT's contrast between the breaking with an intrinsically strong weapon ("an iron rod") and the shattering of an inherently fragile potter's vessel (cf. Craigie) is lost.

## vv. 10-11

### Hebrew Text

ועתה מלכים השכילו  
 הוסרו כל<sup>a</sup> שפטי ארץ  
 עבדו את יהוה ביראה  
 וגילו ברעדה

<sup>a</sup>Omit MT

### Greek Text

καὶ νῦν, βασιλεῖς, σύνετε·

παιδεύθητε, πάντες οἱ κρίνοντες τὴν γῆν.  
 δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ  
 καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ ἐν τρόμῳ.

#### NETS Translation

Now therefore, O kings, be sensible;  
 be instructed, all you who judge the earth.  
 Serve the Lord with fear,  
 and exult in him with trembling.

The concluding section of the psalm (10-12) has a more educational tone in the Greek than in MT, where threat and ultimatum predominate.

παιδεύθητε. Since G consistently translates כִּי by παιδεύω (2.10, 6.2, 15.7, 37.2, 38.12, 93.10, 12, 117.18[bis]) and since the two words overlap in the notion of "discipline," it may well be that G intended no more. One can scarcely overlook, however, that the most common sense of παιδεύω has to do with "teaching," "training," and "educating," and it seems this notion that inspires G's choice of παιδεία in v. 12. It is further of interest that in 89.10 MT's כִּי גַּזְזִים וְנַעֲפִידִים ("they are soon gone, and we fly away" NRSV) is rendered by ὅτι ἐπήλθεν πραύτης ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ παιδευθησόμεθα ("for meekness came upon us, and we shall become disciplined" NETS). Here too the text refers more to the aim of παιδεύω (to become a disciplined individual) than to the tactics employed from time to time to make the pupil achieve that goal (i.e. punishment). A similar note is sounded in 104.22 where MT's לְאַסֵּר שְׂרָיוּ בַּנְּפֶשׁוֹ ("to instruct ["bind" = MT] his officials at his pleasure" NRSV) by τοῦ παιδεύσαι τοὺς ἄρχοντας αὐτοῦ ὡς ἑαυτὸν ("to educate his [Pharao's] officials to be like himself"). The reference is here to Joseph and the context clearly one of "education" and "training." The primary

focus of παιδεύω is thus clear not only from general usage but also from the Greek Psalter itself.

πάντες. Like Rahlfs I have judged this reading to be original, even though several witnesses (Ga La<sup>G</sup> et Cyp.) side with MT in lacking it. Not only is the evidence weak, but it also has a hexaplaric hue, as a result of which an omission was likely caused by Origen's obelos. Of the two remaining options—different parent text from MT or addition by the translator—the former would seem the better one. BHS notes a Hebrew ms, in addition to G, and makes reference to 148.11 which, in a very similar context, features "all" in parallel lines. While it is true that words of quantity are often added in text-transmission, this is scarcely unique to Greek. Though it has been suggested that G may have been responsible for the occasional "fleshing out," it is not without interest that G makes no attempt at harmonizing 2b and 10b, in spite of a number of factors that might be seen to favour it: (a) the ἄρχοντες of 2b and the κρίνοντες of 10b refer to the same group of rebels; (b) יָרַח of 2b is a hapax legomenon in Psalms and might thus have provided some flexibility in rendering; (c) κρίνοντες of 10b apparently narrows the focus of the parent text, since the Greek verb has a more strictly forensic sense than does מַשֵּׁשׁ. Instead, G sticks to his standard practice: since the Hebrew differentiates in 2b and 10b (יָרַח versus מַשֵּׁשׁ), G follows suit. Furthermore, he makes no attempt at deviating from his default equation of מַשֵּׁשׁ - κρίνω, even though the parent text would seem to favour it. We get thus a telling glimpse of G's typical *modus operandi*, one which is minimally interpretive. From that perspective, if "all" in 10b serves to anticipate the concluding line of the psalm, its addition is likely to have occurred in the pre-Greek stage of development. That is to say, it might be argued that, ideally, "all who judge the earth," admonished in 10b, would be co-extensive with all who are pronounced happy in the concluding line of the psalm.

δουλεύσατε. Only rarely does G deviate from his עַבְד־ - δουλ- equation. On the verbal side he opts for προσκυνέω in 96.7 (προσ. τοῖς γλυπτοῖς), and on the nominal side he prefers παῖς in 17.1, 68.18, 85.16, 112.1, and ἔργασία in 103.23. As a result, in the Greek text, here as well as generally, the service rendered is more poignantly marked as that performed by a slave, than is the case in the Hebrew. Cf. further the comment on κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου in v. 2

τῷ κυρίῳ. While articulation here might be perceived to highlight κύριος as an epithet, its presence is in the first instance simply due to G's desire for isomorphism. Since the parent text apparently agreed with MT in reading (יְיָ) יְהוָה, G articulates (cf. comment on ὁ κύριος in v. 4).

ἀγαλλιᾶσθε αὐτῷ. Since in Psalms Hebrew לָגַל is always translated by ἀγαλλιόμαι (19x) (cf. Classical ἀγάλλω) and since both can refer to the verbal expression of joy, no difference in meaning need be posited. Because ἀγαλλιόμαι also translates five other Hebrew roots, it is common throughout the Greek Psalter. It may in fact be labeled a psalmic word, since it appears more than twice as often in Psalms (50x) than it does in the rest of the LXX corpus (20x). In an effort to give the English reader a sense of its frequency it has been rendered routinely by "exult" in NETS, even when the NRSV has an acceptable synonym.

What is of greater interest here is the presence of an explicit object in view of 11a. Though MT is not in need of emendation on this score, it is easy to see that at some point in interpretive tradition the text might be filled out. That αὐτῷ has no basis in Hebrew and thus must have come either from the translator himself or from subsequent Greek transmission history can be demonstrated from G's *modus operandi*. Most often ἀγαλλιόμαι is used absolutely, i.e. without verbal complement. When it does use a complement, the variety it admits is considerable though predictable, since G follows the Hebrew very closely. Thus it takes an accusative when the Hebrew has an unmarked form



(50.16, 58.17, 144.7[contra Rahlfs]), a dative when the Hebrew has a ל construction (80.2, 94.1), ἐν or ἐπί + dat. when the Hebrew uses כ (9.3, 19.6, 32.1, 62.8, 88.13, 17, 91.5, 117.24; 9.15, 20.2, 30.8, 34.9, 39.17, 69.5, 149.2), ἐπί + acc. or gen. when the Hebrew has על (118.162, 149.5), ἐπί + acc. when the Hebrew has אל (83.3), ἐνώπιον [+ gen.] when the Hebrew has לפני (67.4, 5). Since Hebrew גיל, however, is not attested with a ל-complement, and since only a ל-complement would give rise to the added dative in 2.11 ([ἀγαλλιᾶσθε] αὐτῶ), the addition in G is not attributable to the parent text—unless one be prepared also to argue that the parent text read a different verb (likely גנן) from MT. What can of course not be ruled out is that G mentally repeated the final consonants of גיל (גיל) (cf. Mozley 4).

#### v. 12a-c

##### Hebrew Text

נשקו בר פן יאנקי  
 ותאבדו דרך צדקה<sup>a</sup>  
 כי יבער כמעט אפו

<sup>a</sup>Omit MT

##### Greek Text

δράξασθε παιδείας, μήποτε ὀργισθῆ κύριος  
 καὶ ἀπολεισθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας.  
 ὅταν ἐκκαυθῆ ἐν τάχει ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ,

##### NETS Translation

Seize upon instruction, or the Lord may become angry;

and you will perish from the righteous way,  
when his anger quickly blazes out.

In both MT and LXX the first three lines of this verse continue the rebuke to the rebels begun in 10a.

δράξαθε παιδείας. Commentators commonly regard MT's counterpart to this phrase, נשקו בר, as corrupt. So, typically, Craigie (64) calls it the *crux interpretum* of Ps 2. It has further been suggested that G is based on a parent text at variance with MT. Thus while Mozley (5) thinks the verb a paraphrase ("by a simpler figure"), Briggs (23) suggests that both G and Targum) (קבילו אול פנא) had a different text. Dubarle goes a step beyond Briggs and argues that G presupposes נשו קבל. Though MT may well be corrupt, there is reason to believe, with Mozley, that G is based on the same text. Dubarle's reconstruction, though possible in isolation (נשו קבל < נשקובר), on closer scrutiny does not recommend itself. A nominal form of קבל (apart from the siege engine of Ezek 26.9) is not attested in biblical Hebrew. More importantly, had the text read a form of נש, one would have expected λαμβάνω (7x), ἀναλαμβάνω (3x), αἶρω (16x), ἐπαίρω (8x) or several less suitable equivalents, but not δράσσομαι, which in fact occurs only here in the Psalter (and 3x elsewhere for קבילו). While a unique Hebrew-Greek equation need not be ruled out of order *a priori*, it does indicate that one should perhaps have another look at the text we have in MT. We can begin by noting that G knew what the two words meant (or might mean) separately. Since he translates נשק by καταφιλέω in 84.11 he clearly knew its standard meaning. Similarly, that he had a viable meaning for בר is clear from 17.21, 25 (καθαριότης) as well as from 23.4 (καθαρός). Consequently, at issue is the combined meaning of נשק בר. Literally the phrase would mean "to kiss purity" or "cleanliness," and to gloss it thus would have been completely in character with G. But if G understood it as a metaphor for adopting improved behavior, and if he

then decided to interpret the metaphor, as he sometimes does, rather than translating it literally, as he often does, and if he finally rendered the phrase contextually, as he is capable of doing, he might easily end up where he did. It would seem reasonably clear that, primed by παιδεύθητε of 10b, that is exactly what happened. That he has an interest in παιδεία has already become clear in comment on 10b. We can now further refer to 17.36, 49.17 and 118.66. The equation of παιδεία - מוסר in 49.17 ("but you hated παιδεία") one might have expected (see 10b). Unexpected, however, are 17.36 καὶ ἡ παιδεία σου ἀνώρθωσέν με εἰς τέλος ("your παιδεία set me straight completely") for וענוותך תרבני ("your help has made me great" NRSV), and 118.66 χρηστότητα καὶ παιδείαν καὶ γνώσιν δίδαξόν με ("teach me kindness and παιδεία and knowledge") טוב טעם ודעת למדני ("teach me good judgment and knowledge" NRSV). That the Targum, as Dubarle notes, has a similar, interpretive rendering further suggests that behind both may lie a shared exegetical tradition. Of additional interest is the fact that, among the other Greek translators, none insisted on a fully literal rendering: καταφιλήσατε ἐκλεκτῶς Aq ("kiss selectively"), προσκυνήσατε καθαρῶς Sym ("worship in purity"), ἐπιλαβέσθε ἐπιστήμης Anonymous ("lay hold of understanding").

κύριος. Since this divine name or epithet is often added in transmission history, one may regard it secondary here, but since there is virtually no evidence for its absence, it might best be accepted as original text, though like κύριος in 7b, it may well be the contribution of G. As has been suggested, Ps 2 is a relatively heavily interpreted psalm in the Greek.

ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας. Briggs suggests that this derives from צדקתך, and that seems plausible.

ὅταν. The overwhelming default for כִּי is ὅτι (397), but in some 18 cases G opts for a conditional, ὅταν (16) or εἰάν (3). As a result of G's choice of ὅταν over ὅτι in 12c, the

line is not an *assertion* about the Lord's quick temper, but rather a *projection* about what may happen, should his temper flare up. Rahlfs places a full stop at the end of 12b and thus links this clause with what follows. English translations such as Thomson, Brenton, Moore, HTM and VC do likewise, to yield some such sense as, "When His anger suddenly blazeth forth, happy are all they who have trusted in Him" (Thomson). Whatever merits this reading may possibly have had in Greek exegetical tradition, there is no reason to posit it for the OG. Though all except Brenton render ὅταν by "when," one strongly suspects that a questionable understanding of the clause as a so-called General Condition (see Smyth §2295, cf. §1790-93) with reputed iterative/repetitive force—cf. Brenton's "whenever"—is responsible for the common rendering. To be sure, if one reads the text as,

Seize upon instruction, or the Lord may become angry;  
and you will perish from the righteous way,  
whenEVER (i.e. on as many occasions as) his anger quickly blazes out

the last line make no sense, especially not if it be read eschatologically. In that light, it is scarcely surprising that ὅταν clause is linked with what follows. If on the other hand it is simply read as "if (i.e. in the event that) . . ."—as it should be read since ἄν is a modal, not aspectual, particle, the problem at once disappears. Interestingly, Swete who, as Rahlfs notes, placed the stop after 12c, almost certainly reflects OG. (On modality in distinction from aspect see Givón I ch. 8).

ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ. Hebrew **אָפַח** is most often translated by ὀργή (21x), though θυμός is also used (9x), notably when a second term is needed (77.49, 84.4). Since, however, θυμός typically implies a passionate outburst (Louw & Nida 88.178), it is possible that here his choice was influenced by the preceding "quickly" (ἐν τάχει). (Cf. further v. 5 above.)

## v. 12d

## Hebrew Text

אשרי כל חוסי בו

## Greek Text

μακάριοι πάντες οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτῷ.

## NETS Translation

Happy are all who trust in him.

That the closing line of Ps 2 and the opening line of Ps 1 were at some interpretive stage thought to form an *inclusio* (see e.g. Craigie 59-60) receives some support from the Greek text. Since Ps 1 speaks overtly about the "way of the righteous" versus "the way of the impious" (see especially 1.6) and since the rebels of Ps 2 are portrayed as forsaking their former allegiance (i.e. abandoning the "righteous way"), it comes perhaps as no surprise that in 12b G features δικαίως. I have assumed with Briggs that this addition precedes G, but that is not fully assured.

In sum, unlike Ps 1, the Greek of Ps 2 suggests a rich interpretive history both in its pre-Greek stage and at the hands of G.